

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Nevada County Transportation Commission

FROM: Daniel B. Landon, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Executive Director's Report for the November 19, 2003 NCTC Meeting

DATE: November 13, 2003

1. STATUS OF TRANSPORTATION SERVICES JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT (JPA)

On October 28th both Nevada County and Grass Valley approved revisions to the JPA. Nevada City approved the revisions at its November 10th City Council meeting. A copy of the revised agreement is attached. I will keep the Nevada County Transportation Commission (NCTC) informed of any actions taken to implement the revised JPA.

2. USE OF PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE FUNDS

The information below provides citations from the Public Utilities Code and gives a historical perspective of the use of Pedestrian and Bicycle funds in Nevada County.

The Public Utilities Code sets forth the priorities for the use of Local Transportation Funds (LTF) in Sections 99233 - 99233.8. The priorities for Nevada County are as follows:

- 1.) Administration of Transportation Development Act (As needed by the NCTC and Nevada County Auditor).
- 2.) Planning and Programming (Up to 3% of LTF to NCTC).
- 3.) Pedestrian and Bicycle Allocations (2% of LTF remaining to County and Cities).
- 4.) Community Transit Service Allocations (Up to 5% of LTF remaining to Consolidated Transportation Service Agencies: Nevada County and Gold Country Telecare).
- 5.) Public Transportation Operators (Nevada County).
- 6.) Miscellaneous Transportation Allocations (Contract costs for public transportation services and streets and roads purposes: Grass Valley, Nevada City, Nevada County, and Truckee).

With regard to "Pedestrian and Bicycle Allocations", the statutes direct transportation planning agencies (NCTC in Nevada County) to make funds available for pedestrian and bicycle facilities, unless the transportation planning agency makes a finding that the money could be used to better advantage for public transportation or streets and roads purposes in the development of a balanced transportation system. (See P.U.C. Section 99233.3 below).

99233.3. Two percent of the remaining money in the fund shall be made available to counties and cities for facilities provided for the exclusive use of pedestrians and bicycles unless the transportation planning agency finds that the money could be used to better

advantage for the purposes stated in Article 4 (commencing with Section 99260) and Article 4.5 (commencing with Section 99275), or for local street and road purposes in those areas where the money may be expended for such purposes, in the development of a balanced transportation system. Of the amount made available to a city or county pursuant to this section, 5 percent thereof may be expended to supplement moneys from other sources to fund bicycle safety education programs, but shall not be used to fully fund the salary of any one person.

In Nevada County, in concert with the fact that funds for pedestrian and bicycle facilities are set aside before determining population-based apportionments, the County and Cities have taken turns using the pedestrian and bicycle funds. The attached chart shows the annual apportionment of LTF for pedestrian and bicycle facilities since 1986/87, and the amounts actually allocated and expended. Based on the chart, the \$263,376 currently available in the Pedestrian and Bike Account (#5806) would be apportioned as follows:

Grass Valley	\$ 63,420
Nevada City	\$ 9,964
Nevada County	\$ 64,442
<u>Truckee</u>	<u>\$125,550</u>
TOTAL	\$263,376

In summary, NCTC has authority to allocate these funds for purposes other than pedestrian and bicycle facilities if it finds that the money could be used to better advantage in the development of a balanced transportation system, but to do so, would be a significant departure from past practice.

3. STATUS OF REQUEST FOR THE INSTITUTE OF TRANSPORTATION STUDIES (ITS) EVALUATION OF THE STATE ROUTE 49 AND LA BARR MEADOWS ROAD INTERSECTION

Following the October NCTC meeting, I contacted the Institute of Transportation Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, to request an evaluation of the La Barr Meadows Road and SR 49 intersection. The ITS representative indicated that when they send an evaluation team to a community, they like to review more than a single location. Members of the NCTC Technical Advisory Committee identified the following intersections to be reviewed by the ITS team:

- SR 49/La Barr Meadows Road (Nevada County and Caltrans)
- South Auburn Street/Neal Street/Colfax Avenue (Grass Valley)
- Brunswick Road/Idaho Maryland Road (Nevada County)
- SR 174/Brunswick Road (Nevada County and Caltrans)

The following information, taken from the ITS website, summarizes the traffic safety evaluation process:

Free Traffic Safety Evaluations for California Communities

Traffic crashes that cause injury, death, and property damage can be reduced by improving local enforcement and engineering practices and programs.

The Traffic Safety Evaluation (TSE) project of the Technology Transfer Program at the Institute of Transportation Studies begins with a request from your city manager, police chief or director of public works. We schedule a visit by our team of experienced safety experts to address your local issues and find ways to improve:

- *Road design or traffic controls at high crash locations*

- *Bicycle and pedestrian safety in neighborhoods and at schools*
- *Traffic control technologies and signage*
- *Enforcement strategies*
- *Traffic safety record management*
- *Programs for special populations*
- *Training and resource availability*

This project is supported with funds from the California Office of Traffic Safety and is available to any California city or county.

Upon assignment to a community the team reviews available safety data and performs a "windshield" survey of roadway safety conditions.

They then meet with key police and engineering staff to identify local issues, visit problem areas, review current programs, benchmark your community against similar ones in California, help identify problem areas, and recommend solutions.

After a second staff wrap-up meeting, the team prepares a written report to document findings, next-steps and recommendations, best practices and other useful information.

On November 6th I sent out requests for problem statements and data regarding each intersection. As soon as the information is received back, I will forward it to the ITS team and an evaluation visit will be scheduled.

4. STATUS REPORT ON THE DORSEY DRIVE INTERCHANGE PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

On October 30th I attended a Project Team Meeting at Caltrans District 3 in Marysville to discuss Risk Management Planning for this project. Risk Management in this context is a process designed to identify and avoid adverse impacts to the project scope, cost, schedule, and to avoid management by crisis. Although the meeting covered a wide range of topics, it is clear that the most significant risks to the Dorsey Drive Interchange, at this point in time, are the potential for loss of staff resources due to pending staff reductions at Caltrans, and the potential for loss of funding through the 2004 STIP process. Both of these issues will be monitored and reported on when further information is available.

5. REPORT ON THE GATEWAY MONUMENT MEETING

On October 23rd I participated in a meeting of the Gateway Committee established by the Nevada County Board of Supervisors. Those attending the meeting included: Sue Horne (Chairperson, Nevada County Board of Supervisors), Mary Ann Mueller (Grass Valley/Nevada County Chamber of Commerce), Cathy Whittlesey (Nevada City Chamber of Commerce), Chet Krage (NCTC), Terry Williams (South Nevada County Chamber of Commerce), and Doug Farrell and Sue Zajac (Nevada County Department of Transportation and Sanitation).

The Committee reviewed the progress of the project to date and discussed a proposal from a local artist. The Committee determined they were not comfortable making a choice of concept without further input from the community. The Chamber of Commerce representatives have offered to hold a press conference to help with the community outreach process.

Ann Marie Robinson, our planning liaison at Caltrans District 3, suggested that since the Gateway Committee is uncertain what form the entryway project will take, that we proceed under the Caltrans criteria for "Transportation Art" projects. More latitude in the design of the project is given under "Transportation Art" than under the criteria for "Gateway Monument" projects.

6. STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (STIP) STATUS

Last month I reported that the draft STIP Fund Estimate was due by the end of October. However, the draft Fund Estimate was delayed and is now expected to be released on November 18th. The release will be followed by a California Transportation Commission (CTC) workshop held on November 24th. The CTC expects to adopt the Fund Estimate on December 11, 2003. Regional agencies are then to submit Regional Transportation Improvement Programs by April 12, 2004, and the CTC plans to adopt the 2004 STIP on August 5, 2004. The 2004 STIP is expected to have two periods, a negative balance period for 2004/05 through 2007/08, and a positive period in 2008/09. There will be a formula breakdown just as in previous STIP cycles and the regional shares will be established. With the regional shares, yearly "targets" will be calculated. These "targets" are intended to keep the STIP draw on transportation accounts spread out throughout the STIP cycle years.

With regard to the issue of Planning, Programming, and Monitoring funds (PPM), a survey of Regional Transportation Planning Agencies indicates that approximately \$3.5 million is needed during the current fiscal year to keep necessary planning and monitoring activities going, but nearly all agencies will need reimbursement during 2004/05 of their PPM funds. The CTC hopes to have a solution for the PPM issue by the January CTC meeting.

7. REVIEW OF GROWTH IN POPULATION, TRANSIT REVENUES, AND RIDERSHIP

I prepared the attached chart in an effort to better understand the dynamics that have occurred over the last decade with regard to population growth, transit revenues, and transit ridership. The chart clearly shows that ridership on the transit and paratransit systems grew at a rate faster than the general population, and faster than the growth in transit revenue. While some of this growth can be absorbed through increased productivity (i.e. more passengers per hour), the differential between growth in revenues, and growth in ridership, cannot be sustained indefinitely. This is particularly true in relation to capital revenues. During the last decade, the State provided a significant infusion of revenue for the replacement of vehicles (i.e. Proposition 116 Grant Funds and the Rural Transit System Grant Program). The major difference in the data from 1993-2002 from the projections for 1999-2008 is the lack of capital revenue.

On the population side of the chart, it is interesting to note, that in-migration is far greater than natural increase (i.e. increases due to births in the County). This is indicative of our aging population in Nevada County. Having an "older" population means that more of us have need of transportation services, such as those offered by Gold Country Stage and Gold Country Telecare, Inc. As we proceed through the next five years, it will be interesting to maintain this chart and monitor the relationship between population and transit system ridership. Hopefully, as the State gets a handle on the budget issues, we will see more support for capital expenditures. Without additional capital revenues, Local Transportation Funds and State Transit Assistance funds will have to be used for vehicle replacement, which will limit growth in service levels.

attachments